



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/812,308	03/30/2004	Luca Battistini	2818-200	1799		
23117	7590 03/22/2006		EXAMINER			
	VANDERHYE, PC	DELACROIX MU	DELACROIX MUIRHE, CYBILLE			
	GLEBE ROAD, 11TH F N, VA 22203	LOOK	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	,		1614			
			DATE MAILED: 03/22/200	DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Aţ	pplication No.	Applicant(s)					
		10	0/812,308	BATTISTINI ET AL.					
Office Action Summary			aminer	Art Unit					
			bille Delacroix-Muirheid	1614					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi or Reply	cation appear	s on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence ad	ldress				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE M. nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comm operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum sta- re to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months a ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE of 37 CFR 1.136(a). unication. tutory period will ap will, by statute, caus	OF THIS COMMUNICATION In no event, however, may a reply be tirely and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <i>March 30, 2004</i> .								
2a)□			ion is non-final.						
3)	· —								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	I)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-11</u> is/are pending in the application.								
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-11</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicati	on Papers								
9)[The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 March 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).									
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
Attachmen	• •								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary						
3) 🔯 Inforr	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date	10-948) PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Double S) Notice of Informal F		O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/812,308 Page 2

Art Unit: 1614

Detailed Action

The following is responsive to the preliminary amendment received March 30, 2004.

Claims 1-8 are cancelled. New claims 9-11 are added.

Claims 9-11 are currently pending.

Applicant's Claim for Priority Under 35 U.S.C.§§ 119(e) and/or 120

The complete disclosure of parent application 10/137,699, filed May 3, 2002 to which the present application claims benefit under 35 USC § 120 has each been considered. Sufficient support and enablement as required by 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, for the presently claimed subject matter has <u>not</u> been noted in U.S. 10/137,699. Accordingly, for the purposes of examination and the application of prior art, the effective filing date of the present application is considered to the filing date of PCT/IT03/00237, April 15, 2003.

Specification

The specification is objected to because it does not contain a section entitled "BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS". Please see MPEP 608.01.

PLEASE NOTE: regarding cross-reference to related applications, applicant is respectfully requested to update status information for 10/137,699 filed May 3, 2002 by submitting an amendment that inserts the corresponding patent information since this application has matured into USPN 6,797,722.

Claim Rejection(s)—35 USC 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/812,308 Page 3

Art Unit: 1614

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mistrello et al.

Mistrello et al. discloses a method of studying the immunological profile of DL111-IT, also known as 3-(2-ethylphenyl)-5-(3-methoxyphenyl)-1H-1,2,4 triazole. Specifically, Mistrello et al. teach administering effective amounts (2mg/kg/day) of DL111-IT to female rats with polyarthritis. The results demonstrate that DL111-IT is an effective immunosuppressant. Please see the abstract; page 165, Adjuvant arthritis; page 168, first full paragraph).

The claims are anticipated by Mistrello et al. because Mistrello et al. teach administration of the identical active agent, i.e. 3-(2-ethylphenyl)-5-(3-methoxyphenyl)-1H-1,2,4 triazole, to a host in need thereof, using applicant's claimed method steps. Therefore, treatment of uveitis would be inherent.

Claim Rejection(s)—35 USC 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mistrello et al, supra.

Mistrello as applied above.

Mistrello et al. do not teach that the mammal is a human; however, based on the desirable results obtained in the female mice with polyarthritis, Mistrello suggests that DL111-IT would be useful as a therapeutic agent in clinical medicine (page 168, first full paragraph). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect DL111-IT to act as an immunosuppressant in humans suffering from arthritis.

Conclusion

Claims 9-11 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid** whose telephone number is **571-272-0572**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs. from 8:30 to 6:00 as well as every other Friday from 9:30-6:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/812,308 Page 5

Art Unit: 1614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Christopher Low**, can be reached on 571-272-0951. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CDM March 19, 2006

Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid Patent Examiner Group 1600